

Memorandum

To : Commissioners

Date : February 7, 1979

From : Diane Landry

Subject: Organization of the staff report prepared for the S.A.M. projects
(P-79-93, -94, -95)

The S.A.M. Board has elected to divide the total S.A.M. project into two phases, transmission line, ocean outfall and reclamation line being the first. The actual treatment facility or facilities will be deferred to a later date. The first phase of the project has been submitted to the Coastal Commission as three related, but separate, applications (P-79-93: Transmission Line/Pump Station; P-79-94: Ocean Outfall; and P-79-95: Reclamation Line). In order to avoid duplication, staff has prepared a common background report for all three applications. This report summarizes the history of the S.A.M. project, cites Coastal Act Regulations applicable to Sewage Treatment facilities, defines the limits of Commission review and includes information on the financial impacts of the project. It should be noted that most of the documents summarized in the chronology have not been included but will be made available to Commissioners if desired.

The specifics of each individual S.A.M. project are dealt with in the separate reports which follow the Background Report.

DSL/cw

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

S.A.M. is the acronym for Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside, a joint powers association made up of the three Sanitation Districts which serve the partially urbanized Mid-Coastside Communities of Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton and the City of Half Moon Bay. The three member districts are Montara Sanitation District, Granada Sanitation District and the Half Moon Bay Sanitation District. A map attached to this report shows the district boundaries and service areas for each of the three districts. Currently, each district maintains facilities to accommodate development within its service areas. Montara Sanitation District operates a .50 mgd (ADWF¹) capacity, sewer plant (secondary level of treatment) with an ocean outfall located just north of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. Current flows through the plant are .18 mgd (ADWF). The Granada Sanitation District operates a plant which has a design capacity of .30 mgd (primary level of treatment) with an ocean outfall located just south of the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve. Current flows exceed the design capacity of this plant and average .32 mgd (ADWF). The Half Moon Bay Sanitation District is served by a sewer plant which has a design capacity of 1.0 mgd average dry weather flow at an N.P.D.E.S. Permit for only .6 mgd capacity (secondary treatment level) with a defective ocean outfall near the mouth of Pillarcitos Creek. Current flows through this system are .45 mgd (ADWF).

None of the sewer plants meet the Regional Water Quality Control Board's standards for effluent quality. Similarly, none of the existing ocean outfalls meet the RWQCB's standards. The Montara and Granada outfalls are inadequate because of their proximity to the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, a Designated Area of Special Biological Significance (ASES). The Half Moon Bay outfall is unable to meet standard because it broke at the surf line on March 23, 1978 and the landward and seaward sections of the pipe are separated by at least forty feet. Chlorinated effluent from this plant is currently discharged onto the state beach near Pillarcitos Lagoon. All three S.A.M. Districts are currently under Cease and Desist Orders from the RWQCB and new hook-ups are precluded.

The purpose of the S.A.M. Association and project is to improve treatment levels, meet standards for ocean discharge and gain additional sewer connections for each of the member districts.

The original S.A.M. project was a two part proposal; P-77-366, a consolidated 2.0 mgd sewage treatment plant, pump stations and transmission line and P-77-838, an ocean outfall to serve the Montara and Granada Sanitation Districts and a reclamation line. The on-shore facilities (P-77-366) were the subject of several Regional Commission hearings during the summer of 1977. Commission approval of this application was granted on August 15, 1977 with conditions limiting the S.A.M. "service area" and plant capacity to 1.3 mgd until the Local Coastal Plans (LCP) were prepared. Other conditions were also attached to the permit, however the two mentioned in the preceding sentence were the major ones and reflected Commission concerns that the construction of sewage treatment facilities not prejudice the ability of the local jurisdictions (City of Half Moon Bay and San Mateo County) to prepare their LCPs. Representatives of the S.A.M. Board indicated that these conditions were unacceptable and appealed to the State Commission. In September of 1977, the State Commission ruled that the S.A.M. Appeal presented no substantial issue and the Regional Commission's

1 ADWF, Average Dry Weather Flow

findings and conditions were upheld.

In October of 1977, this S.A.M. project was again before the Commission with a proposal to show how the condition for a 1.3 mgd plant would be met. S.A.M. proposed that the removal of one influent pump, conditioning of the N.P.D.E.S. permit to 1.3 mgd and deletion of some aeration equipment would provide compliance with the condition. Commission staff recommended a reduction in the physical size of the aerators, clarifiers and pumps to accommodate no more than a 1.3 mgd average dry weather flow. Staff also recommended that the N.P.D.E.S. permit be conditioned to authorize a maximum flow of 1.3 mgd (ADWF). The S.A.M. representatives indicated that the staff recommendation was unacceptable and asked that the Commission vote on the S.A.M. proposal. The S.A.M. proposal was defeated and the Commission indicated the plant should be redesigned to a 1.3 mgd capacity.

The permit granted for the on-shore facilities was never accepted by the S.A.M. Board, although one member district, Granada, did vote to accept the permit.

The second part of the total S.A.M. project was the construction of an ocean outfall and reclamation line. (P-77-838). The proposed ocean outfall, 18" in diameter and 2,000' in length was to carry the combined discharges of the Montara and Granada Sanitation Districts. The outfall was to have had a capacity of 3.46 mgd (PWWF)² and was planned to be located ±300' south of the existing (and at that time functioning) Half Moon Bay outfall which entered the surf near the mouth of Pilarcitos Creek. The reclamation line was proposed to extend from the consolidated treatment plant, located on the site of the existing Half Moon Bay sewer plant, south to the Half Moon Bay Country Club (±3.4 miles). This line was to carry treated effluent to the golf course for use in irrigating the greens and would have replaced a temporary line currently used for this purpose. It was hoped that with assurances of a high quality effluent, other reclaimed water buyers such as the floriculture operators, would be found.

The permit for the outfall and reclamation line (P-770838) was approved by the Regional Commission in December of 1977. Conditions requiring a monitoring period and use of the outfall for the transport of secondary effluent of acceptable quality were, among others, attached to this permit. Both the outfall and reclamation line pipe sizes were approved as proposed. The conditions were, apparently acceptable to the S.A.M. Board and this permit was formally accepted and no appeal was filed.

To summarize then, the first permit, P-77-366, on-shore facilities was never accepted by the S.A.M. Board and lapsed in August of 1978. The second permit, P-77-838, ocean outfall and reclamation line, was accepted by the S.A.M. Board but was never exercised, thus in December of 1978, it too, expired.

During the past year, several events have occurred which have, directly or indirectly, precipitated the applications currently before the Commission. The following narrative/chronology attempts to describe key events of the past many months.

S.A.M. CHRONOLOGY

August 15, 1977 - Coastal permit for a consolidated 1.3 mgd sewer plant/pump stations/transmission line granted by the Regional Commission. Decision appealed by S.A.M. to the State Commission.

September 1977 - State Commission declined to hear S.A.M. appeal. Regional Commission upheld for a 1.3 mgd plant as conditioned.

October 24, 1977 - Regional Commission hearing on S.A.M. compliance with condition #1 (limit capacity to 1.3 mgd) of sewer plant permit.

Commission determined that the condition would be met by redesigning the consolidated treatment plant to a capacity of 1.3 mgd.

December 9, 1977 - Public hearing, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Half Moon Bay (hearing panel)

The purpose of this RWQCB hearing was to review the status of the regional sewer plant project and discuss water quality violations by the S.A.M. member districts. (Montara, Granada and Half Moon Bay). Lengthy public testimony was given at this hearing regarding the S.A.M. project and reasons for the specific water quality violations were offered by the individual sanitation districts. RWQCB staff presentations included a revised time schedule for the S.A.M. project, reports detailing violations and a recommendation for a connection ban on all three districts.

December 12, 1977- Regional Commission granted a permit (P-77-838) for the construction of a 3.46 mgd (Peak Wet Weather Flow) ocean outfall to serve the previously approved on-shore treatment facilities (P-77-366). A reclamation line was also approved as part of this application.

This permit was accepted by the applicant and was not appealed to the State Commission.

December 19, 1977- Regional Water Quality Control Board Hearing (Full Board). At this meeting, a connection ban was imposed on all three S.A.M. member districts by the RWQCB. A revised schedule for compliance was included with the cease and desist order issued by the Board. (see attached order).

January 30, 1978 - Letter from Neil Dunham of State Water Resources Board to Ed Brown, Regional Commission Executive Director requesting staff analysis of a "phased" S.A.M. project.

- February 14, 1978 - Response to SWRB inquiry by Regional Commission staff
- February 21, 1978 - Letter received from Paul Leger, Chairman of the S.A.M. Board to Regional Commission. Mr. Leger requested that the cover letter and attached engineering report be accepted for filing as an application for a "phased" S.A.M. project.
- March 1, 1978 - Commission staff response to S.A.M. letter. Staff indicated that the information submitted was not complete enough to accept as a "filable" application for a hearing.
- March 21, 1978 - RWQCB Hearing. The RWQCB authorized a partial lifting of the sewer connection ban and granted the equivalent of 77 single-family home connections to the Half Moon Bay Sanitation District. No connections were authorized for Granada or Montara Sanitation Districts.
- March 23, 1978 - Half Moon Bay Sanitation District ocean outfall broken.
- April 17, 1978 - Letter of Fred Dierker to Montara Sanitation Board Members clarifying status of 54 outstanding sewer connection permits.
- May 16, 1978 - Regional Water Quality Control Board issues a Clean-up and Abatement Order to Half Moon Bay Sanitation District because of broken outfall. (See attached order)
- June 8, 1978 - Application for a modified S.A.M. project received by Regional Commission Office
- June 14, 1978 - Regional Commission letter to S.A.M. Board indicating application for three separate sewer plants is not complete and cannot be filed.
- June 20, 1978 - Regional Water Quality Control Board hearing on S.A.M. schedule.

RWQCB staff report indicated that the S.A.M. project was substantially behind the schedule adopted by the RWQCB in December 1977 and that efforts on the part of S.A.M. to comply with the terms of the December CDO schedule had been sketchy and ineffective.

S.A.M. representatives indicated that the delays were unavoidable and some S.A.M. Board members felt a Regional treatment plant was no longer an appropriate solution to the problem. Funds to pursue a three plant, 2.3 mgd total capacity, wastewater reclamation line between Montara and Half Moon Bay and a common ocean outfall were requested.

RWQCB indicated S.A.M. could apply for funds through the normal procedure if they wished. RWQCB accepted staff recommendation for a new time schedule for S.A.M. which includes two dates July 25, 1978 - by which time an application for some S.A.M. project (new application, amendment request etc.) must be filed with the Regional Coastal Commission and October 1, 1978 - by which time, S.A.M. must have secured a Coastal Permit and be actively pursuing the project authorized by that permit. If these dates are not met, the Executive Director of the RWQCB, after consultation with the Chairman will place the matter in the hands of the Attorney General for enforcement.

- July 18, 1978 - Informal meeting of S.A.M. Board representatives, Coastal Commission (San Mateo County LCP Team) and Regional Water Quality Control Board representatives, staff members from S.A.M., Coastal Commission, RWQCB and State Water Resources Board. The purpose of this meeting, called by the S.A.M. Board, was to informally discuss the status of the S.A.M. projects. A lengthy discussion of the S.A.M. situation, alternatives to the original project and agency policies occurred. Public comments were also taken at this meeting.
- July 28, 1978 - Commission staff meeting with the S.A.M. manager and attorney to discuss potential S.A.M. projects and review filing requirements and issue areas. The status of the existing permits (P-77-366 and P-77-838) was also discussed.
- August 14, 1978 - Application for an upgrading of the Half Moon Bay and Montara sewer plants, construction of a new Granada plant, common ocean outfall and transmission and reclamation lines was submitted by S.A.M.. The application was incomplete and applicant notified of deficiencies.
- October 31, 1978 - Meeting of agency (Coastal Commission, RWQCB, State Water Resources, S.A.M., Attorney General's Office) staff and S.A.M. Board representatives. The purpose of the meeting was to explore the possibilities for a phased project that would alleviate current outfall problems. A commitment for a subsequent meeting to allow time for research and a decision by the S.A.M. Board on a definite project was agreed to.
- November 30, 1978 - Meeting of agency (Coastal Commission, S.A.M., RWQCB, State Water Resource Board, Attorney General's Office) staff and S.A.M. Board Representatives. It was determined at that meeting that a phased project would be pursued by S.A.M.. The first phase would include the construction of a transmission line, ocean outfall and reclamation line. S.A.M. representatives present indicated they would submit applications for these projects to the Regional Coastal Commission in the near future. S.A.M. representatives indicated they would prefer to

put off the question of sewage treatment capacity and thus construction of new sewage treatment facilities until the Local Coastal Plans, currently under preparation, showed population projections for the Mid-Coast areas served by the three districts. Agency staff agreed with this course as long as all needed new facilities, including treatment plants, were operational by July 1983. (See attached letter dated December 26, 1979 from Ray Walsh of the SWRB for additional information on this meeting).

- December 19, 1978 - S.A.M. submits three separate applications for; (1) Transmission line, pump stations (2) Ocean outfall sized to accommodate all three district flows and (3) Reclamation line. These applications were reviewed by staff and found to be incomplete. Applicant notified of deficiencies December 27, 1978.
- January 12, 1979 - Regional Water Quality Control Board files legal action (complaint for Injunctive Relief and Civil Penalties) against S.A.M. and the three member districts (Half Moon Bay, Montara and Granada Sanitation Districts).
- February 2, 1979 - S.A.M. applications P-79-93 (transmission line and pump stations), P-79-94 (ocean outfall) and P-79-95 (reclamation line) filed for hearing on February 15, 1979.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Commission's Jurisdiction under the Coastal Act of 1976

Under the Coastal Act of 1972 (Prop. 20) the Coastal Commission was required to review projects in regard to a full range of water quality impacts. The Coastal Act of 1976 states that the State Water Resources Control Board and California Regional Water Quality Control Board are the State agencies with primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality, with the Coastal Commission having review over land use impacts of wastewater treatment works.

Section 30412 of the Coastal Act of 1976 specifies the aspects of wastewater treatment work which are to be reviewed by the Commission in the permit process. The Act states:

30412. (a) In addition to the provisions set forth in Section 13142.5 of the Water Code, the provisions of this section shall apply to the commission and the State Water Resources Control Board and the California regional water quality control boards.

(b) The State Water Resources Control Board and the California regional water quality control boards are the state agencies with primary responsibility for the coordination and control of water quality. The State Water Resources Control Board has primary responsibility for the administration of water rights pursuant to applicable law. The commission shall assure that proposed development and local coastal programs shall not frustrate the provisions of this section. Neither the commission nor any regional commission shall, except as provided in subdivision (c), modify, adopt conditions, or take any action in conflict with any determination by the State Water Resources Control Board or any California regional water quality control board in matters relating to water quality or the administration of water rights.

Except as provided in this section, nothing herein shall be interpreted in any way either as prohibiting or limiting the commission, regional commission, local government, or port governing body from exercising the regulatory controls over development pursuant to this division in a manner necessary to carry out the provisions of this division.

(c) Any development within the coastal zone or outside the coastal zone which provides service to any area within the coastal zone that constitutes a treatment work shall be reviewed by the commission and any permit it issues, if any, shall be determinative only with respect to the following aspects of such development:

(1) The siting and visual appearance of treatment works within the coastal zone.

(2) The geographic limits of service areas within the coastal zone which are to be served by particular treatment works and the timing of the use of capacity of treatment works for such service areas to allow for phasing of development and use of facilities consistent with this division.

(3) Development, projections, which determine the sizing of treatment works for providing service within the coastal zone.

The commission shall make these determinations in accordance with the policies of this division and shall make its final determination on a permit application for a treatment work prior to the final approval by the State Water Resources Control Board for the funding of such treatment works. Except as specifically provided in this subdivision, the decisions of the State Water Resources Control Board relative to the construction of treatment works shall be final and binding upon the commission and any regional commission.

(d) The commission shall provide or require reservations of sites for the construction of treatment works and points of discharge within the coastal zone adequate for the protection of coastal resources consistent with the provisions of this division.

(e) Nothing in this section shall require the State Water Resources Control Board to fund or certify for funding, any specific treatment works within the coastal zone or to prohibit the State Water Resources Control Board or any California regional water quality control board from requiring a higher degree of treatment at any existing treatment works.

It is important to keep in mind that the above cited Section of the Coastal Act specifies that the Commission may make determinations on treatment works only in regard to impacts within the coastal zone. This application proposes facilities which will service areas only within the coastal zone.

By Section 15 of Chapter 10 of The Coastal Act the Legislature made the following amendments to the State Water Code:

SEC. 15. Section 13142.5 is added to the Water Code, to read:
13142.5. In addition to any other policies established pursuant to this division, the policies of the state with respect to water quality as it relates to the coastal marine environment are that:

(a) Waste water discharges shall be treated to protect present and future beneficial uses, and where feasible, to restore past beneficial uses of the receiving waters. Highest priority shall be given to improving or eliminating discharges that adversely affect any of the following:

- (1) Wetlands, estuaries, and other biologically sensitive sites.
- (2) Areas important for water contact sports.
- (3) Areas that produce shellfish for human consumption.
- (4) Ocean areas subject to massive waste discharge.

Ocean chemistry and mixing processes, marine life conditions, other present or proposed outfalls in the vicinity, and relevant aspects of areawide waste treatment management plans and programs, but not of convenience to the discharger, shall for the purposes of this section, be considered in determining the effects of such discharges. Toxic and hard-to-treat substances should be pretreated at the source if such substances would be incompatible with effective and economical treatment in municipal treatment plants.

(b) For each new or expanded coastal power plant or other industrial installation using sea water for cooling, heating or industrial processing, the best available site, design, technology, and mitigation measures feasible shall be used to minimize the intake and mortality of all forms of marine life.

(c) Where otherwise permitted, new warmed or cooled water discharges into coastal wetlands or into areas of special biological importance, including marine reserves and kelp beds, shall not significantly alter the overall ecological balance of the receiving area.

(d) Independent baseline studies of the existing marine system should be conducted in the area that could be affected by a new or expanded industrial facility using sea water in advance of the carrying out of the development.

(d) Adequately treated reclaimed water should, where feasible, be made available to supplement existing surface and underground supplies and to assist in meeting future water requirements of the coastal zone, and that consideration, in statewide programs of financial assistance for water pollution or water quality control, shall be given to providing optimum water reclamation and use of reclaimed water.

These Water Code amendments reinforced the State Water Resources Control Board's major responsibility for water quality and placed emphasis on the protection of coastal resources.

Special Regulations for sewage treatment works

The State Commission adopted special regulations which specified timing for Commission review of wastewater treatment plant permit applications for sewage treatment works without meeting all normal approval requirements of Section 13052 of the regulations as long as the following general conditions are met:

- (1) The preliminary application is accompanied by a draft facilities plan, including a draft Environmental Assessment, draft Environmental Impact Report, or proposed Negative Declaration; (2) the applicant agrees to notify the Commission and any appropriate Regional Commission in writing of any proposed adoption of a Negative Declaration for such sewage treatment works at least thirty (30) days prior to adoption of such Negative Declaration; (3) the applicant agrees to vote on the application until sixty (60) days after the filing of a complete application pursuant to Section 13652.

Section 13652 of the special regulations for sewage treatment works define a complete application:

13652. Completeness of Application. A permit application for such sewage treatment works shall be deemed to be complete only when the application is accompanied by a final Facilities Plan as defined by regulations of the State Water Resources Control Board, including a final Environmental Assessment, final Environmental Impact Report, or adopted Negative Declaration, as appropriate. For purposes of this section, the Facilities Plan shall not be deemed to be final unless the staff of the State Water Resources Control Board advises the Regional Commission in writing that the documents are in final form and unless the final Facilities Plan includes sufficient information to allow an assessment of the financial impact of the funding of such treatment works on all properties in the affected service district(s) located within the coastal zone. Any addendum to or material modification of the final Facilities Plan shall extend the Regional Commission review period an additional thirty (30) days.

The S.A.M. situation is unique in The Central Coast Commission's review of wastewater projects under these special regulations. In this particular case a final EIR (1975), a final Facilities Plan, EPA Negative Declaration, and financial information on local funding of the proposal, were submitted as a part of this application. Pursuant to the regulations the State Water Resources Control Board has submitted a letter (January 22, 1979) to the Regional Commission certifying that all necessary documents are complete and that environmental certification previously given is still valid. (Attachment) Therefore, it appears that the applications are complete (pursuant to Section 13652 of the Commission Regulations) and the Commission will have 60 days from the filing date to vote on the applications.

Status of the Mid-Coastside Local Coastal Plans

The SAM Board has indicated that they would prefer to put off the decision of sewage treatment capacity and therefore the construction of a treatment plant or plants, until the LCP's were far enough along to show population projections for the Mid-Coast communities served by the three member districts. The decision on whether a single, regional sewer plant or three separate ones will also be decided at a later date. Given this arrangement, which will be formalized as an agreement between the State Water Resources Board, RWQCB, and S.A.M. and the three member districts, it is evident that the progress of San Mateo County and the City of Half Moon Bay's respective LCP's are relevant to this and future phases of the S.A.M. project. The following paragraphs summarize the progress of the County and City LCP's and offer estimates of completion dates for each.

San Mateo County LCP

San Mateo County has the responsibility for preparing the Local Coastal Plan for Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton/Pillar Point Harbor as well as for the remainder of the unincorporated coastal zone in the county. The Sanitation Districts included in San Mateo County's planning area are all of the Montara District and much of the Granada District.

Upon Coastal Commission approval of their Work Program in March of 1978, San Mateo County received State/Federal funding in the amount of \$156,000 to prepare their LCP. They have been working steadily on their plan since that time and estimate completion of the LCP by this summer. It is very likely that they will meet their anticipated date for completion.

City of Half Moon Bay LCP

The City of Half Moon Bay has the responsibility for the preparation of the LCP for those lands within their incorporated boundaries. All of the Half Moon Bay Sanitation District and a portion of the Granada District (serving the Miramar/Frenchmen's Creek Area) are included in the City's planning area.

A Work Program for both the Land Use and Implementation portions of the City's LCP was the subject of a hearing before the Regional Commission on September 28, 1978. Based on comments from the public, Commission and staff, the Work Program was revised and will be presented to the Commission during the evening portion of the February 15, 1979 meeting in Half Moon Bay. Commission staff has prepared a combination staff analysis and recommendation for this Work Program and is hopeful that Commission action on it will occur February 15. The Work Program will then be forwarded to the State Commission for final approval and funding in March.

Although the City has been somewhat slower getting into the coastal planning process than San Mateo County, they may, by virtue of smaller area to cover, fewer and less complex issues, etc., be able to do some "catching up" with the County. Under favorable circumstances, it is not inconceivable to project an autumn 1979 completion date for the Half Moon Bay LCP. Even if all of the work is not finished by that time, the plan should be advanced enough to give a fair picture of land use and population projections.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

As noted in the detailed staff reports on each of the applications, the Commission's role in reviewing the projects is limited by Coastal Act Sec. 30412. One aspect of which the Commission's decision (rather than the Water Boards') is determinative (final) would be -

- 30412(c) (2) The geographic limits of service areas within the coastal zone which are to be served by particular treatment works, and the timing of the use of capacity of treatment works for such service areas to follow for phasing of development and use of facilities consistent with this division.

Commission regulations (Sec.13652) specify the need to include, in the final project Facilities Plan which supports a complete application for sewage treatment works, "sufficient information to allow an assessment of the financial impact of the funding of such treatment works on all properties in the affected service district(s) located within the Coastal Zone."

The purpose of financial-impact review becomes clearer upon reading two important policies of Chapter 3 ("this division" cited above):

- 30241: The maximum amount of prime agricultural land shall be maintained in agricultural production to assure the protection of the area's agricultural economy, and conflicts shall be minimized between agricultural and urban land uses through all of the following:

(d) By assuring that public service and facility expansions and nonagricultural development do not impair agricultural viability, either through increased assessment costs or degraded air and water quality.

- 30254 New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

Cost estimates were prepared for the previous S.A.M. project in 1976, and have been modified by the S.A.M. Manager to reflect the projects applied for in 1979. Table A (attached) shows the 1976 costs in \$1000's of the various project components. (Subtotal reflects the 1979 applications). The "Eligible Flow" of 1.3 MGD refers to the treatment capacity deemed eligible for 87½% grant funding by the State Water Resources Control Board. As noted in the staff reports, the treatment plant component of the overall S.A.M. Facilities Plan is not currently proposed. Total project cost is therefore estimated at

\$3,353,000	1976 cost
792,000	18 months/15% inflation
40,000	outfall modification and incidental costs
<hr/>	
\$4,185,000	TOTAL 1979 COST

Assuming that 86% of the costs are grant-funded (87½% of the outfall and transmission facilities, and 72% of the reclamation line), the local share of project costs is \$585,000.

The most recent information on the financial impacts of this portion of the total S.A.M. project is included in the following pages of this report. Figures given on Table "A" are in thousands of dollars, (i.e. pumping station M total cost would be \$228,000). Additional staff comment on the financial impacts of this project will be given at the February 15 hearing on the S.A.M. applications.

